REMARKS

Claims 1-4 are pending and have been rejected. Claims 5 and 6, reciting additional embodiments of the present invention, have been added. Support for the new claims appears, e.g., in paragraph 0019 of the application as published. Accordingly, claims 1-6 are submitted for further consideration in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Hendricks et al. (Hendricks) '386 in view of Roberts et al. (Roberts), and further in view of Ito et al. (Ito), all of record. The PTO again asserts that Hendricks discloses every limitation of the present claims except the generation of a smooth transitional view between at least two of a plurality of cameras, whereby a continuous change of camera angle is provided. The PTO urges that Roberts' teaching of the use of multiple cameras, with transitions between two fields of view, together with Ito's teaching of a single camera that automatically tracks a moving object along an expected route, in combination, would have led one of ordinary skill to the presently claimed inventions.

Applicant submits, however, that the teachings of the cited references cannot be combined to yield the presently claimed invention as proposed by the PTO. Firstly, Ito's teaching is not simply to "follow a moving object", but is specifically to track a moving object along an expected route, and for automatically controlling various camera settings such that images of objects moving along such a path can be captured in an optimal manner. Secondly, applicant must reiterate that the Roberts system, which allows for continuous *tracking* of the same target ("The user control may comprise a mouse or a like operative device operable to control a cursor which can be used to *track* the target and to indicate when it has *moved to an image transition region*", Roberts paragraph 0011), does not appear inherently to create a smooth, i.e., continuous *change of camera angle* during the transition, or to suggest doing so. Rather, as previously submitted, an abrupt, discontinuous change of camera angle appears to be clearly possible, and appears to be the more likely and expected result. Thus, the PTO's conclusion that Roberts suggests a continuous change of camera angle, as presently claimed, appears to be grounded in hindsight reconstruction of the presently claimed invention. The combined teachings of Ito and Roberts, therefore, cannot properly be combined with the teachings of the primary Hendricks reference in order to render obvious the subject matter of claims 1-4. Withdrawal of the rejection on this basis is courteously requested.

Claims 1-4 also stand provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory, obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-25 of copending application serial no. 11/516,250. Applicant will provide an appropriate terminal disclaimer in the event that one or more of the foregoing claims are found allowable.

Applicant respectfully submits that newly added claims 5 and 6 are also patentably distinguished over the foregoing references, and furthermore, that the foregoing references do not appear to disclose, suggest or contemplate a system that provides on-line viewing of views from a moving vehicle as presently claimed. Passage to issue of the newly added claims is earnestly solicited.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is submitted that all present claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated.

Respectfully submitted,

3/15/2010
Date

Michael M. Gerardi
Reg. No. 33,698

2801 Townsgate Road, Suite 200
Westlake Village, CA 91361
Tel: (951) 672-4354